10/29/70

Dear Dick (Paul)

An in-between response to your 23 to Pa and me, before picking up my wife. And thanks for the enclosure, of which I'd heard but not seen.

On the fragmentation, which floored me when I first discovered it. you should reread that, for it is more you way you you say in developing your argument. Study the semantics.

Morgan's representation to Howard. I believe, without time to check and it is close to two year since I read- that he even misloceted. His description also is dubious, at best.

Weapon: remember, we discussed this a long time ago. I had conjectured something like the Hornet, and you'd they suggested the Weatherby or something like that would have been better, exactly what you now say, but before the panel report. It might help Pa if he got the Remington-Peters catalogue, the sheet on the Nossler bullet, etc.

When I get more into the spectro suit, and I've no time for advance detailing, more of this will, I think, become understandable.

What you say of Dallas doctors is at least consistent with what Perry told me, and Pa ought remember he located the rear, non-fatal wound other than the WR or the medical mythology, giving me his source and proving it out, right then and there.

Pa should also understand, and correct me if I am wrong, that the reporting of what happened, in even the official accounts, rules out the possibility of a) the Mannlicher-Carcanno and b) the full-jacketed, military load.

When I resume my autopsy writing, I'd like to have on hand to quote, like from standard pubs, NRS, such things on the fast, small, light projectiles.

Meanwhile, although I cannot and will not go into it, I tell you that continuing study of what I told Pa I now have and he hasn't seen indicates strongly that any firm statement of nothing to the front is foolish, separate from physics, for study of the better film I now have strongly suggests the presence of evidence and this study is not yet complete, an enormous amount of technical and lab work being involved- and being done. When it is done, of course, others will have access. On some of it good, clear slides and blowups up to 14" (!) now exist. More, time and motion studies of the kind Alvarez should have done and didn't are being made. Good enlargements of parts of the frames have been made, i.e., need only in one study. While I've not yet seen this, I'm told it is informative. I strongly suggest that there is new hazard in association with anything out of context and obviously incomplete.

Hurriedly,